UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,171	08/11/2006	Stefan Andersson	9564-17	6861

54414   7590   02/25/2009
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.
P.O. BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER
CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 April 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is FINAL.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11 August 2006_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _8/11/2006_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1.   Applicant's claim for benefit of domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is

acknowledged.

        The application is filed on 8/21/2006 but has a U.S. provisional application number

60/545,833 filed on 2/19/2004.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "with <u>Library</u> to

Library m" should be corrected with "<u>Library 1</u> to Library m". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

        The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
> publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
> NOTE: The term "others" in 35 U.S.C. 102(a) refers to any entity which is different from the inventive entity.
> The entity need only differ by one person to be "by others." This holds true for all types of references eligible
> as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) including publications as well as public knowledge and use.

3.   Claims 1 – 3 and 9 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Anderson (EP 1361527 A1).

        As per claim 1 and 18, Anderson teaches a method of providing a dynamic security

management in an apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

        a platform for running an application (Anderson: Figure 1);

a security manager for handling access of the application to functions existing in the apparatus (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 7);

an application interface between the platform and the application (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 4: API (Application Interface));

a set of access permissions stored in the apparatus and used by the security manager for controlling access of the application to functions through the application interface (Anderson: Column 3 Line 12 – 24) the method comprising:

downloading into the apparatus an object containing access permissions applicable to at least one function (Anderson: Column 2 Line 39 – 41 / Line 50 – 54 and Column 3 Line 12 – 19: the downloaded application and signatures of permission information can be considered as the object);

verifying the object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 21 – 24); and

installing the access permissions together with the existing permissions (Anderson: Column 4 Line 28 – 30).

As per claim 14 and 31, Anderson teaches a method of providing a dynamic security management in an apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

a platform for running an application (Anderson: Figure 1);

a security manager for handling access of the application to functions existing in the apparatus (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 7);

an application interface between the platform and the application (Anderson: Figure 1 / Element 4: API (Application Interface));

a set of access permissions stored in the apparatus and used by the security manager

for controlling access of the application to functions through the application interface (Anderson:

Column 3 Line 12 – 24 and Column 2 Line 50 – 54), the method comprising:

storing the access permissions in a security policy (Anderson: Column 4 Line 49 – 58

and Column 3 Line 56 – 58: access permission information is indeed related to a security

policy); and

providing the security policy with a hierarchical structure (Anderson: Column 4 Line 49 –

58 / Line 3 – 30 and Figure 2: (a) a hierarchical structure of a set of root-certificates and

attribute certificates; (b) where the root-certificate is mapped to an attribute certificate through

an identifier (e.g. public key)).

As per claim 2 and 19, Anderson teaches the object is verified by checking a certificate

chain of the object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 20 – 38).

As per claim 3 and 20, Anderson teaches verifying that a policy of the function allows

updates (Anderson: Column 3 Line 20 – 24 and Column 4 Line 35 – 38).

As per claim 9 and 26, Anderson teaches the access permissions are contained in a

policy file (Anderson: Column 3 Line 56 – 58: access permission information is indeed related to

a security policy).

As per claim 10 and 27, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure linking access

levels of existing functions with a domain associated with the downloaded object (Anderson:

Column 4 Line 4 – 57: (a) permission rights must be associated with an access level according

to a security policy and (b) a set of structures (e.g., permission certificates) are linked with an identifier (e.g., signature / public key identifier), which is qualified as a domain ID – i.e. a group / domain of <u>mapped certificates</u>).

As per claim 11, 16, 28 and 33, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure linking access levels of existing functions with information contained in a certificate chain (Anderson: Column 4 Line 20 – 38 and Column 4 Line 4 – 57).

As per claim 12, 17, 29 and 34, Anderson teaches the information includes a signature of the end entity certificate, a signature of an intermediate certificate, or specific level information (level OID) (Anderson: Column 4 Line 19 – 24: a signature).

As per claim 13 and 30, Anderson teaches the policy file has a structure including logical expressions (Anderson: Column 4 Line 50 – 54: a file structure indeed includes logical expressions).

As per claim 15 and 32, Anderson teaches the security policy has a structure linking access levels of existing functions with a domain associated with the downloaded object (Anderson: Column 4 Line 4 – 57 / Line 20 – 38: (a) permission rights must be associated with an access level according to a security policy and (b) a set of structures (e.g., permission certificates) are linked with an identifier (e.g., signature / public key identifier), which is qualified as a domain ID – i.e. a group / domain of <u>mapped certificates</u>).

As per claim 35, Anderson teaches the apparatus is a portable telephone, a pager, a

communicator, a smart phone, or an electronic organizer (Anderson: Column 2 Line 37 – 41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 4 – 8 and 21 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Anderson (EP 1361527 A1), in view of Yarsa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,912).

As per claim 4, 7, 21 and 24, Anderson does not disclose expressly installing a library

comprising new routines and/or new functions to be called by an application or another library

stored in the apparatus to enable access of functions through the application interface.

Yarsa teaches installing a library comprising new routines and/or new functions to be

called by an application or another library stored in the apparatus to enable access of functions

through the application interface (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20: DLL Library routines called by

an applet class application program with built-in security mechanism).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Yarsa within the system of Anderson because

(a) Anderson teaches a security mechanism of defining a generic profile for controlling an

interface in connection with applications so that the application is allowed limited access to

existing software / function through an interface (Anderson: Column 3 Line 55 – 58 and Column

2 Line 50 – 54), and (b) Yarsa teaches an improved security mechanism on API (Application

Interface) by providing functions with built-in dynamic link library (.DLL), namely, native code

library, and accessed through the Java Native Interface (JNI) by a class that has access rights

to load DLL library codes (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20: DLL Library routines called by an applet

class application program with built-in security mechanism).

As per claim 5, 8, 22 and 25, Anderson as modified teaches the new routines and/or

new functions can access existing functions through the library (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20).

As per claim 6 and 23, Anderson as modified teaches when accessing functions,

recursively checks the permissions of the application interfaces and libraries in a linked chain

related to the called functions (Yarsa: Column 3 Line 9 – 20).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to LONGBIT CHAI whose telephone number is (571)272-3788. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

        /Longbit Chai/

    Longbit Chai E.E. Ph.D
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431
        10/13/2008